(1)

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS. Secdt. II-20 —60,000—4-1-52.

P. W (1952) Department.

~~Endorsement~~
~~D.O.~~
Memorandum
~~Lodged~~

No. 102266 Q/ST-5

Dated 24-12- 1952.

Closed

FURTHER PAPERS.

Department.	Number.	Series.	Date.
G.O.Ms.	4207	P.W.D.	31-10-'53

From
Sri.K.K.Nambiar, B.E.,M.I.E.(Ind),
F.Inst.H.E.(Eng),M.I.Mun.E.(Eng),
M.Am.So.C.E.,M.R.San.I.,
Chief Engineer Highways,
Chepauk., Madras-5.

To
The Secretary to Government,
Public Works Department.,
Madras.

Letter No.57058-D2/51-1 dated., 20-11-1951.

Sir,

102266

Sub:- Contracts - High Ways Department R.D.F. works-South Kanara Division Constructing submersible bridges in M.23/ 6 24/3 and 27/3 of Bisley Ghat Road - Tender proposals - Acceptance.

I forward herewith a copy of letter Roc. No.D3/245/51 Dated. 2-11-1951 from the Superintending Engineer (Highways) IV circle with enclosures on the subject and in the circumstances explained therein the lowest negotiated offers of M/s. P. Ramaswamy & Co., Coimbatore for the 3 undermentioned bridge works at their tender percentages etc noted against them may be approved at an early date.

NAME OF WORK.	ESTIMATE VALUE.	CONTRACTOR VALUE.	TENDER PERCENTAGE.
	Rs.	Rs.	
1. Bridge at M.23/6	35164	48770	38.69%above ESTIMATE.
2. " M.24/3	51 197	72547	41.70% "
3. " M.27/3	40756	59193	45.24% "

As the works are urgent and grants have to be drawn from Central funds I request very urgent orders on the tender proposals.

I invite attention in this connection to State Government's letter No.62364A/51-2 dated 25-7-1951 to the Government of India.

Enc:- Copy of S.E's letter dated 2-11-1951.

For Chief Engineer Highways,

P.W.(Q)

The G. of I. have not sanctioned the above works. The C.E.(H) has since stated in his letter of 3.12.51, that the tender proposals put up in this reference, may be deferred for the present till the position is got clarified by the G. of I. as they may like over like 6.1.52 or till a reply to G. of I. letter dated 25.7.51 is received in the ref. prop. reference proposed to be issued in file No: 62364-Q/51

6.12.51

8.12.51

2

Re-submitted with ref. to 'x' in plaint, the G. of I. have been addressed in this deptt's letter No. 6263-9/51-10 dt 12.1.52. This may therefore lie over till a reply is received from the G. of I.

12.1.52

13.1.52

1.1.52

Re-submitted.

The G. of I. have not sent a final reply sanctioning the works. This may lie over till 10.3.52 or till the reply of the G. of I. is received whichever is earlier.

27.2.52

27.2.52

27.2.52

10.3.52

1632E

A.S.2

Box

PHD 27

REGISTERED POST.

HIGHWAYS DEPARTMENT.

From

Sri. P.T. Narayanan Nair B.E.,
Superintending Engineer (H)
Fourth Circle, Coimbatore.

To

The Chief Engineer (H)
MADRAS.

Sir,

Roc.No.D3/245/51 dated 2nd November 1951.

Sub:- Contracts - Highways Department - R.D.F. works South Kanara Division - Constructing submercible bridges in miles 23/6, 24/3 and 27/3 of Bisoley Ghat Road - Tenders proposals recommended - approval - requested.

Ref:- Chief Engineer's (H) Letter No.16760-J2/51-2 dated., 12.7.1951.

Tenders were called for and due on 27-6-51 for the bridges in miles 24/3 and 27/3 of Bisley Ghat Road. In response, only two tenders were received for both the works from the following contractors at the rates noted against them.

	Percentage above estimate rates.	
Bridge at.	24/3	27/3
1. M/s. P. Ramaswamy & Co., Coimbatore.	67.78 %	74.83%
2. M/s. Gannon Dunkerley & Co., (Madras) Ltd., Madras.	43.81 %	55.5%

These tenders were rejected as the percentage excess of tenders received for the above works were considered high.

Re-tenders for the above works were called for upto 29.9.51 along with the tenders for the bridge in mile 23/6 of the same road.

In response to this only two tenders were received for all the three works, from the same two contractors as follows (using mass concrete 1:3:7½) mix with 1½ " size hard granite stone for masonry)

	Percentage above estimate rates.		
Bridge at.	23/6	24/3	27/3
1. M/s. P. Ramaswamy & Co., Coimbatore.	34.11%	35.17%	45.51%
2. M/s. Gannon Dunkerley & Co., Madras.	37.03%	37.90%	49.19%

While calling for tenders for the above three works:--

(1) For earthwork excavation, in foundation rates were called for (a) Earthwork excavation, for foundation in all soils, excluding rock requiring blasting above water level including all leads and lifts complete and

P.t.o.

(b) Earthwork excavation for foundations in all soils, excluding rock requiring blasting below water level including all leads and lifts forming islands or ring bund, shoring and and structing, but exclusive of bailing and pumping charges.

Very high rates were quoted by the contractors for all items requiring bailing and pumping, due to the uncertain amount of bailing and pumping charges involved. Hence this uncertain items was excluded from the contractors quoted rate. For bailing and pumping, payment will be made at actuals plus 10% as per clause 63 (c) (ii) of Preliminary Specifications to M.D.S.S.

(2) The sanctioned estimates for these works provide only coursed rubble masonry for piers and abutment. However, alternate rates were called for. Mass concrete (1:3:7½) mix using 1½" size (a) broken shingle jelly (b) hard granite broken stone, instead of coursed rubble masonry, due to the diffuculty experienced in getting skilled labour in this locality.

M/s. P. Ramaswamy &Co., did not quote any rates for the earthwork items in all the three works. But the stipulated that they should be paid at actuals plus 10 per cent in the tender schedule. In order to have proper comparison they were asked to quote specific rates for these items and they have quoted their rates in their letter dated 3-10-1951 enclosed Tenders have been compared allowing these rates.

For masonry M/s. P- Ramaswamy & Co have quoted rates for

(1) Coursed rubble masonry.

(2) Mass concrete (1:3:7½) mix using 1½" size broken shingle.

(3) Mass concrete (*1:3:7½) mix using 1½ " size hard granit stone.

Whereas M/s Gannon Dunkerley & Co, have quoted rates only for

" Mass concrete (1:3:7½) mix using 1½ " size hard granite stone".

Hence tenders have been compared adooting Mass concrete (1:3: 7½) mix with 1½" size hard granite stone for masonry.

The lowest tenderer for all the above three works is M/s. P. Ramaswamy & Co.

Negotiations was carried on with the lowest tenderer M/s. P. Ramaswamy & Co., and they have reduced their rates for some items for the above works in their letter dated 13-10-1951 and 31-10-1951 (Enclosed) M/S. P. Rama swamy & Co., have also rectified the following discrepancies.

The rates quoted by them in their letter dated 29.9.51 (Enclosed) for mass concrete (1:3:7½) mix is with 1½" to 4% hard granite metal, but the size specified in the tender schedule is 1½". They have since agreed to use 1½" size metal for mass concrete (1:3:7½) at their quoted ratesin their letter dated 19-10-1951 (enclosed)

(2) The rates quoted by them for item 9 in the tender schedule for the bridge at 24/3 of Bisley Ghat i.e. for "cement concrete (1:2:4) mix with 3/4" size hard granite broken stone for wearing coat over deck slab", is Rs.225-0-0 per 100 Cft whereas the total amount given in column

P.T.O

column 8 of tender schedule for this item is Rs.2,485/ - for 775 C.Ft. In their letter dated 7-10-1951 (enclosed) they have represented that their quoted rate is only Rs.325/100 Cft. for the item and that the rate of Rs.225/- 100 Cft. noted in their tender schedule only a clerical error. The estimate rate for this item of work is Rs.226-0-0/100 C.Ft and their quoted rate for other bridge works in Mile 23/6 and 27/3 is Rs.350/--100 Cft ./in col.8 of the tender schedule/. Their total amount given by them for this item is Rs.2485/- for 775 Cft and this total amount is taken as correct. A rate of Rs.320/30/- 100 Cft arrived at on this basis is accepted. The contractors have also agreed to this revised rate in their letter dated 18-10-1951 (enclosed). The contractors in their letter dated 31-10-1951 have also agreed to do the masonry work in coursed rubble at the same rate as per mass concrete 1:3:7½) mix i.e. for Rs.205/100 C.Ft and that they may be allowed the choice to use coursed rubble or mass concrete as may be convenient to them during actual execution.

The tender percentage of M/s. P. Ramaswamy & Co., as modified by their letters dated 13.10-1951 and 18-10-1951 (enclosed) is as follows. (using mass concrete (1:3:7½) mix with 1½" size hard granite stone for masonry.)

B ridge at.	Percentage above estimate rate. 23/6	24/3	27/3
1. Tender of M/s. N. Ramaswamy & Co., Coimbatore.	34.11%	35.17%	45.51%
1.(a) Negotiated tender of M/s. P. Ramaswamy & Co., Coimbatore.	32.15%	34.55%	39. 91 %
(2) Tender of M/S. Gannon Dunkerely and Co., Madras.	37.03%	37.90%	49.19%

The rates quoted by M/s. P. Ramaswamy & Co., for coursed rubble masonry and as modified by thei letter dated 31-10-1951 has also been compared for all the above three works and their tender premium for coursed rubble masonry has also been worked out. And their tender premium for the same is asfollows:----

	Percentage over estimate rate Tender.	Negotiated tender.
1. Constructing a submersible bridge in M.23/6 of Bisley Ghat Road.	45.28%	38.69%
2. Constructing a submersible Bridge in Mile 24/3 of Bisley Ghat Road.	44.07%	41.70%
3. Constructing a submersible bridge in Mile 27/3 of Bisley Ghat Road.	52.58%	45.24%

M/s. Gannon Dunkerley have not quoted any rates for coursed rubble masonry hence no percentage excess for their tenders is worked out.

I recommend the lowest negotiated tender of M/S. P. Ramaswamy & Co., coimbatore using coursed rubble masonty for piers and abutments as follows.

P.T.O.

1. Constructing a submersible bridge at K.23/6 of Parley Chat Road. ₹.69% above estimate

2. Constructing a submersible bridge at K.24/1 of Parley Chat Road. 41-70% above estimate rate

3. Constructing a submersible bridge at K.27/2 of Parley Chat Road. 45.24% above estimate rate.

All the above three bridges have to be constructed in reserve forest area, and fully material localities intervened with hilly hills. The formation level at 15/1 of the road is unformable for [illegible] in the year and during this period these works are inaccessible [illegible] the trailer portion is irremovable.

As this is the best working season for the execution of the above works, and the forests have to be drawn from central depot, I request early orders may kindly be issued to start the works forthwith.

Separate comparative statement in regards enclosed.

Encls: 1. Trailer received on 27.6.1951
2 trailer received on 29-9-1951
together with two comparative statement.
3. Contractor's letters 1 file 18 pages (9 letters)
4 statement of particulars.
5 statement.

× × × ×
For Superintending Engineer

MM/23-11/-

True copy.

11/26 S.V. Venkatakrishnan
Superintendent

Extract of para 7 of Chief Engineer's letter No.16760-J2/51-5 dated 3-12-1951, to the Secretary to Government, P.W.D., Madras.

***

Sub:- construction of Bridges in rc. 25/6,24/3 26/2 and 27/2 of Aisley Cuddalore Road.

XXX xxx XXX

In this connection, I invite your reference to this office letter No.57058-D2/51-1, dated 20-11-1951 wherein tender proposals received from the Superintending Engineer (Highways) have been submitted to Government for approval in respect of these works. As these works are now in tender proposals stage, I recommend that they may be deferred for the present till the position is got clarified by Government of India. I am also instructing the Superintending Engineer (Highways) and Divisional Engineers (Highways) that while following the instructions contained in G.O.No.32 P.W.D. dated 4-1-1951 in cases wherever particulars of sanctioned estimates have not yet been approved by Government of India, they should restrict the expenditure within the ten percent limit and in other cases, they should submit the particulars of sanctioned estimates in the usual course, and commence works only after Government of India's specific approval is obtained. In the circumstances stated above, I request that Government of India may be pressed at least to approve the proposals under reference as a special case, so that the works for which tenders have been called for, may be proceeded with. Government of India may also be requested to clarify the term "Free balance" in detail.

(True extract).

From
Sri P.P.Nambiar,B.E., M.I.E.(Ind)
F.Inst.H.E.(Eng)M.I. [illegible]
.Am.Soc.C.E., F.Sa[illegible].,
Chief Engineer,(Highways)
Chepauk,Madras.5.

To
The Secretary to
Government,
Public Works Department,
Madras.

31 MAR 1952
PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

Letter No.57058 [illegible] dated 25-3-'52.

Sir,

Sub:- Contracts-Highways Department-P.W.D. Works-South Kanara division-constructing submersible bridges on M.23/6, 24/3 & 27/3 of Hosley ghat road-tenders-Acceptance.

21737

Ref:-My letter No.57058 D2/51-1 dt.20-11-51.

-v-v-

I invite attention to my letter quoted above and request early orders on the tender proposals recommended therein.

for Chief Engineer, (Highways)

ktk/27.3.

P.W(Q)

Memo: No.

Contracts - Highways Deptt. R.D.F works - South Kanara Division - constructing submersible bridges on the Bisley Ghat Road.

Ref:- From the C.E(H) letter No. 57058. D2/51-1 of 20.11.51 of ~~25.5.52~~

The C.E(H) is informed that the question of according sanction to the tender proposals submitted by the C.E. in the letter cited will be taken up only after the sanction of the G. of I is received to the construction of the bridges.

To the C.E(H)

11

Re-submitted. The G. of I. have since agreed to the construction of four bridges ~~on the~~ in lieu of causeways on the Bisley Ghaut Road. The connected file is under circulation. This may be wd till orders issue in that ~~case~~ file.

file no 12364/51

2.5.52

3.5.52

3.5.52

3.5.52

(Fwd)

This may be examined now. Since orders sanctioning the bridges are likely to issue shortly

5.5.52

4/2

With reference to orders of D.S on p 11 ante, orders have been issued sanctioning the construction of the bridges referred to and the connected file required for disposal, has been submitted regarding the interpretation of the term 'Free Balance'. ~~Req~~ This may/ therefore be over till the return of the file.

pl pushy grant

M

M 13.5.52

14.5.52

13/5/52

13

From
Sri K.K.Nambiar,B.E.M.I.E(Ind)
Inst.H.E(Eng)M.I.Mun.E.(Eng)
M.Am.Soc.C.E.M.R.San.I.,
Chief Engineer,(Highways)
Chepauk, Madras .5.

To
The Secretary to Government,
Public Works Department,
Madras.

ADDL. ASST. SECRETARY TO GOVT. 28 MAY 1952 PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

Letter No.57058 D2/51.4d/23-5-52.

Sir,

Sub:-CONTRACTS-Highways department-RD.P.F.works-south Kanara divn-constructing submersible bridge Mile 23/6, 24/3 & 27/3 of Bisley ghat road-Tenders-Acceptance

Ref:-My letter No.57058 D2/51.1 dated 20-11-51.
-do- No.57058 D2/51.3 dated 25-3-52.
G.O.Ms.No. 2007 P.W. dated 8-5-52.

I invite attention to the above and request very early orders on the tender proposals recommended in my letter first quoted above.

for Chief Engineer.(Highways)

ktk/23.5.

14

P.W.(Q)-1

Memo

Sub:- C.R.F.- Contracts - Highways Deptt - South Kanara Division - Constructing submersible bridges on the Bisley Ghat Road.

Ref. From the CE.(H) Ch.No. 5705&D2/51-4 d 23-5-52

The matter is still under the consideration of the Govt.

To, The C.E.(H)

HB/29.5.52
ML
29.5.52

NOTE The connected file required for disposal has been sent to ~~Govt~~ D. regarding the interpretation of the term 'free Balance' vide M on p12 ante. Draft above is for approval.

HB 29.5.52
ML
29.5.52

PI Matter on VE & put up with proposals
Govt
30/5/52

15

P.W.D.(Q-1).

Memo.No. 102266 A/51-1 D/ 3-6-52.

Subject:- C.P.F - Contracts - Highways Department - S.Kanara District - Constructing submersible bridges on M.23/6, 24/3 and 27/3 of Bisley Ghat Road - Tender proposals - Acceptance-regarding.

Ref:- G.O.Ms.No.2002 P.W. d/ 8-5-52.
From the C.E(H) letter No.57058-D2/51-1 d/ 20-11-51.
Government T.M.No.67924-A/51-6 d/ 8-5-52

--

The C.E(H) has reported that the tender percentages in respect of the three bridge works are 38.69%, 41.70% and 45.24% above the estimate rates.

The attention of the C.E.(H) is invited to the G.O.No.2002 d/ 8-5-52 and T.M.cited in which the C.E(H) was asked as to why in cases like this (i.e. where tenders are far in excess of estimate rates,) departmental execution of works should not be considered and he is requested to state urgently whether departmental execution was considered in the case and if not as to why this work should not be executed departmentally

To the C.E(H), Madras.

-17

Copy of letter No.61122-D2/51-5 dated 8th August 1952 from the Chief Engineer (Highways), Madras to the Secretary to Government Public Works Department, Madras:-

--

Sub:-Central Road Fund Works - South Kanara Division -Construction of R.C.T. Beam Slab Bridge across Matlai stream in M.55/1 of Mangalore Chervathur Coast Road and of submersible bridges at M.23/6, 24/3 and 27/3 of Bisley Ghat Road - Tender proposals - Acceptance.

(File herewith separately)—Ref:-Government Memo.No.2994-Q/52-6 dated 31-5-1952.
-do- No.102266-Q/51-1 dated 3-6-52.—p15 ante

--

1/ The Superintending Engineer (Highways) Coimbatore has reported the following reasons for the high premium tenders received for the above works:-

(1) The works are located in out of the way places, in jungles infested with wild animals and in malarial regions. In view of this, labour camps cannot be situated near the workspot and there is waste of time in transporting labour daily to site and back.

(2) Due to heavy rainfall the working season is limited. The flood season is as much as 4 months which increases the risk involved In addition imported workmen have to be disbanded at the close and camp reestablished in the next season which involves risks and costs.

(3)A good number of bridges have well foundations which require trained divers. There are no local divers and they have to be imported from distant places like pondicherry.

(4)At some places even unskilled labour has to be imported. There is none doing granite masonry work in South Kanara District and they have to be imported from Coimbatore.

(5)South Kanara is a deficit district and there is therefore difficulty for rice which is their staple food.

(6) There is not much competition as there are only 3 contractors who usually tender for bridge works. As they are from far-off places, their overhead charges are high.

(7) The high tender premium is only in case of bridge works.

2/ As regards doing the works departmentally the Superintending Engineer reports that they are already in a special locality for which 20% over schedule rates has been allowed and that the labour has to be imported and camps established away from bridge sites with the result that they have to be conveyed daily to and back from worksite. He is of opinion that no pieceworker will come forward to do the works at rates lower than those recommended by him. Further these works are urgent and cannot wait until the department sets up necessary tools and plant and arrange for labour camp for the imported labour etc. Owing to the Pepper season in these areas it is also very difficult to get labour in some seasons. Advances have to be paid to coolies. Food grains and other facilities have also to be arranged.

3/ For reasons stated above it is not possible to do the works departmentally at rates less than those now recommended with all the difficulties and risks involved therein and I request that tender proposals already recommended may be approved at an early date.

--

(True Copy)

P.W.D.(R-1).

Letter No. 1022869/51-3 Dated 21-10-52 1952.

To

The Secretary to the Government of India,
Ministry of Transport (Roads Organisation)
Jamnagar House, New Delhi.

Sir,

Sub: Central Road Fund - South Kanara District constructing submersible bridges at M.23/6, 24/3 and 27/3 of Bisley Ghat Road

Ref: From the Govt. of India, Ministry of Transport (Roads Organisation), letter No.WII-23(2)/51 dated 19-4-1952.

I am directed to invite attention to the Government of India's letter cited above and to request that in the circumstances set out in the enclosed statement, the Govt. of India may be moved to accord their revised approval to the works at a cost of Rs.48,770/- (Rupees forty eight thousand and seven hundred and Seventy), Rs.72,547/- (Rupees Seventy two thousand five hundred and forty seven) and Rs.59,193/- (Rupees Fifty nine thousand one hundred and ninety three only) respectively and their approval communicated at an early date. Pending receipt of their approval the Chief Engineer (Highways) is being authorised to proceed further in the matter if it is very urgent.

Yours faithfully

STATEMENT.

1.	Amount of estimate for which approval was accorded by Govt. of India for four bridge works	Rs.1.22 lakhs
2.	Details in regard to tendered amounts in respect of three of the works	

P.T.O.

Sl. No. (1)	Name of work (2)	Estimate value (3)	Contract value (4)	Excess over estimate (5)
		Rs.	Rs.	
1.	Bridge at M.23/6	44,000/-	48,770/-	10.84%
2.	Bridge at M.24/3	65,000/-	72,547/-	11.61%
3.	Bridge at M.27/3	48,000/-	59,193/-	23.31%

3. Reasons for the excess:- It has been reported that there is no likelihood of obtaining any lower tenders for these works, which are in out-of-the-way places and for which labourers will have to be conveyed daily to the work site and back. Further, in view of the pepper cultivation in this area, it might become difficult to get labour in some seasons.

20.10.52

21/10/52

21.10.52

Draft II.

Endorsement No. 622662/524 Dated 21-10-52.

Copy communicated to the C.E.(H) with reference to his letter No.6112-D/51-5, dated 8-8-52. He is authorised to proceed further in the matter if it is very urgent..

To the C.E.(H)

20.10.52

21/10/52

21.10.52

Telegrams :
" ROADIND."

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.
MINISTRY OF TRANSPORT : ROADS ORGANISATION.

96291

JAMNAGAR HOUSE,
Shahjahan Road.

No. WII-23(1)52 *New Delhi*, the-2, the 12 NOV 1952

From

Shri K.Ranganathan,
Under Secretary to the Govt. of India.

To

The Secretary to the Govt. of Madras,
Public Works Department, Madras.

Subject:- Road development works in Madras to be financed from the State's allocations from the Central Road Fund.

.....

Sir,

With reference to your letter No.102266-Q/51-3, dated the 21st October 1952, on the subject noted above, I am directed to say that in the circumstances explained in that letter, the President is pleased to approve of the revised cost of the following bridge works aggregating Rs 1,80,510/- (Rupees one lakh, eighty thousand, five hundred and ten only), being met from the allocations to Madras from the Central Road Fund.(This is in partial modifications of the orders conveyed in this Ministry's letter No.WII-23(2)/51, dated the 19th April 1952, vide S.No.3 in the Statement in para 1 of that letter.)

S.No.	Name of work.	Amount debitable to Central Road Fund. Rs
1.	Constructing a bridge in Mile 23/6 of the Bisley Ghat Road in the South Kanara District.	48,770
2.	-do-Mile 24/3 -do-	72,547
3.	-do- Mile 27/3 -do-	59,193
	Total	1,80,510

2. I am to request that, upon technical sanction of the detailed estimates for these three works, and for constructing a bridge at Mile 26/2 of the Bisley Ghat Road, by the competent authority, the usual particulars thereof may kindly be intimated to this Ministry for communication to Audit.

Yours faithfully,

Under Secretary to the Govt. of India.

Enc.Nil.
"N.SINGH"
12/11/52.

P.W.D C(2) +
Endt No 102266 Q/51-5 dated 16-11-52
Copy Communicated to the C.E(H) for necessary action with reference to his letter No 57058-D2/51-1 dated 20-11-52

8

23

From
Sri K.K.Nambiar,B.E.,M.I.E.(Ind),
F.Inst.,H.E.(Eng),M.I.Mun.E.(Eng),
M.Am.,Soc.,C.E.,M.R.,San.,I.,
Chief Engineer (Highways),
Chepauk, MADRAS - 5.

To
The Secretary to Government,
Public Works Department,
Fort St. George,
MADRAS - 9.

Letter No. 57058-D2/51-6 dated 13--11-1952.

****

ADDL. ASST. SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
15 NOV 1952
PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT
96927

Sub: Central Road Fund - South Kanara District - Construction of Submersible bridges at M.23/6, 24/3 and 27/3 of Bisley Ghat Road.

Ref: P.W.D. Endorsement No.102206-Q/52-4 dated 21-10-52.

****

The above works are being entrusted to M/s. P.Ramaswamy & Co., Coimbatore, for execution as they are urgent and as this is the working season. I request that the appeal to the lowest negotiated officers of M/s. P.Ramaswamy & Co., may be sent early.

vv.13.11.

for Chief Engineer (Highways).

P.W.D(Q.D)

Memo No 102266 Q/51-8 Dated 24-12-52

Sub: C.R.F. South Kanara Dt - Construction of submersible bridges at M 23/6, 24/3 and 27/3 of Bisley Ghat Road - Tender - Acctd

Ref: From the C.E.(H) Lr No 57058-D2/51-6 dated 13-11-52

The C.E.(H) is informed that his proposals to entrust the above works to M/s. P. Ramaswamy & Co, Coimbatore at contract values of Rs 48770/-, Rs 72547/- and Rs 5919/- have been accepted. His attention in this connection is also invited to Govt Endt 102266/P.W. dated 14-11-52.

2. The tender papers received with the letter no 57058-D2/51-1 dated 20-11-51 are returned herewith.

To,
The C.E.(H),
with tender papers
kept in cover
To be sent in a sealed cover).

P.W.D.(C).

Sub:-C.P.F - Contracts - H.W.Department -S.Kanara Division - Constructing submersible bridges on M.23/6, 24/3 and 27/3 of Bisley Ghat Road- Tender proposals - Acceptance.

Ref:-G.O.Ms.No.2002 P.W. d/ 8-5-52.
From the C.E(H) letter No.57058-D2/51-1 d/ 20-11-5
" letter No.57058-D2/51-4 d/ 23-5-52.

Please see the communications cited from the C.E(H). The case relates to the construction of submersible bridges at M.23/6, 24/3 and 27/3 of Bisley Ghat Road in S.Kanara District. The C.E(H) has furnished the offers of the tenderers at their tender percentages etc. for the above mentioned bridge works and recommends the lowest negotiated tender of M/s.P.Ramasamy & Co.,,Coimbatore. It seems that the lowest negotiated offer of the above firm for the above-mentioned bridge works at their tender percentages etc. is far in excess of the estimate value and exceeds the 10% limit as may be seen from the statement furnished by the C.E(H) at p.1 c.f.

2.It may be mentioned that in G.O.Ms.No.2002 d/ 8-5-52 orders have been issued sanctioning the construction of four bridges in Bisley Ghat Road, S.Kanara District. In that file after the issue of the orders, the question of clarification of 'free balance' has been taken up and a note for circulation as to whether the Government of India should be addressed or not, has been submitted. The question of according sanction to the tender proposals submitted by the C.E(H) has to be taken up now in this file and the Government of India addressed to accord their administrative approval to the revised estimates. It is pointed out in this connection that in another file, the C.E. has been asked to offer his remarks, as to whether departmental execution of the works should not be taken up in cases like this i.e where the revised estimates exceeds far above the original sanctioned estimates and the C.E's reply has just been received. Though the C.E. may have replied to the latter case we may make a reference to him in this case also as each case may have its own peculiarities. It has also to be pointed out that in another the Govt.

2

of India have refused to give grants from the C.R.F.
Draft submitted for approval.

31/5/52

31.5.52

31/5/52

31.5.52 through A

31.5.52

3.6.52

[Issued as Memo. No. 102 266 Q/51-4 dt 3-6-52] p15 ante
[From the CE.(H) Lr. No. 61122-D2/51-5 dt 31/5/52] p17 ante

--

XX In June 1950, the Government of India sanctioned from the C.R.F. the necessary amounts for the construction of four causeways at M.23/6, 24/3, 21/3 and 27/3 of Bisley Ghat Road in S.Kanara District at a cost of Rs.36,000/- On investigation it was found that construction of bridges instead of causeways at the crossings mentioned above was necessary and the C.E(H) accordingly submitted proposals for the construction of four bridges at a cost of Rs.1,97,000/- for addressing the Government of India. The Government of India who were addressed on 25-7-51 declined to approve the proposal and suggested that the scheme might be postponed or the question of financing them from this State's revenues might be considered. But the matter was pressed with the Government of India for a reconsideration of their orders and the Government of India approved the proposal in April, 1952. This Government have also accorded their administrative approval and the C.E. has been requested to furnish details of the estimate for communication to audit through the Government of India after the estimate for the work is technically sanctioned by the competent authority. The C.E(H) has forwarded the offers of the tenderers at their tender percentages etc. for three of the four above-mentioned bridge works (i.e. works at M.23/6, 24/3 and 27/3 of Bisley Ghat Road) and has recommended the lowest negotiated tender of M/s.P.Ramaswamy & Co., Coimbatore. With ref. to M.(Fin)'s minutes in another file, the C.E(H) was asked to offer his

p15 ante (M)
& p17 ante (M)
para 4 on p9 ante (M)
pp 35-37 ante (M)
pp 41-43 ante (H)
p47 ante (H)
para 2 on p[illegible] ante (M)
p.1 ante
(A section file not found)

remarks as to whether departmental execution of the works should not be taken up in cases like this i.e. where the revised estimates far exceeds the original sanctioned estimates. Following this, a reference was made to him in this case also.

(H section file. not putup)

p 15 cf

2. The C.E's reply in this connection at p.17 c.f. may be perused. On account of 'X' on p.17 c.f. the C.E(H) has stated that it is not possible to do the works departmentally at rates less than those recommended by him on p.1 c.f. with all the difficulties and risks involved therein and has requested that the tender proposals already recommended may be approved at an early date.

para 3 on p 17 cf

3. In the circumstances, the lowest negotiated tender of M/s. P.Ramaswamy & Co., Coimbatore for the bridge works may be accepted. Of the amounts of estimates approved by the Government of India, viz, Rs.44,000/- Rs.65,000/- and Rs.48,000/- respectively for the construction of the bridges at M.23/6, 24/3 and 27/3 of Bisley Ghat Road, the amounts of tender for which approval is now sought are Rs.48,770/, Rs.72,547/- and Rs.59,193/- respectively. The percentage of excess over the estimate value works out to 10.84%, 11.61% and 23.31% respectively. As the excesses are over 10%, the sanction of the Government of India is necessary with ref. to para.17 of their Memo, explaining the C.R.F. rules and procedure.

'K' on p 1 cf

'Σ' on p 42 cf of (H)

'K' on p 1 cf

working sheet at (K)

p 20 cf of (H)

The Government of India, may therefore be addressed. Draft letter to the Government of India put up, is for approval. Finance may see.

HP/28/8/52

28.8.52

30.8.52

2.9.

4.9.52

P. W.D.(C-1)

D.S. desired raised that the following question should be examined:-whether tender proposals of sanctioned C.R.F. works which are above 10% should be sent to Government of India for approval or whether the C.E(H) or the competent authority should approve them and particulars of sanctioned estimates alone forwarded to the Government of India for their approval.

2. The procedure that is being followed in respect of works to be financed from the allocations for this State from the C.R.F. is as shown below:-

Proposals submitted by the C.E. in regard to road works and bridge works are put up to the Government of India for their approval and the Government of India accord their approval. In every case, the Government of India request this Government, that upon sanction of the estimate for the work by the competent authority, the usual particulars thereof may be intimated to them for communication to audit. The C.E. or the competent authority technically accords sanction and proceeds with the execution of the work in accordance with G.O.Ms.No.32 P.W. d/ 4-1-1951. The C.E. then sends particulars of estimates sanctioned by him which are forwarded to the Government of India. The Government of India then permit the audit to admit the expenditure. The orders of the Government of India in this regard are communicated immediately to the C.E. (Highways).

3. Before work is executed tenders are called for. Under the existing orders in force, the previous approval of the Government should be obtained to the acceptance of tenders above estimated rates:

i) in the case of the work the cost of which does not exceed Rs. 5 lakhs if the tender rates exceed the estimate rate by more than 40%

and (2) in the case of works exceeding Rs.5 lakhs all cases of tenders which exceed the estimate rates.

4. It may also be mentioned in this connection that

pp 22-23 of L.F. IV

para 6 on p 23 of L.F. IV

the Government of India in their letter d/ 19-2-52 indicated that their approval was necessary for all works which exceed the sanctioned estimate by 10%. The C.E: has been informed that in future he should not anticipate the approval of the Government of India to excesses of more than 10% and that the revised approval of the Government of India to charge the enhanced cost of the work to the State's R.F. allocations should be obtained in time. He has been therefore asked to issue suitable instructions to the subordinate officers. The Government of India's sanction is necessary with reference to para. 17 of the Memo. explaining C.R.F. rules and procedure.

para 2 on pp 26-27 of L.F. IV

p 20 of (M)

5. In another case, the C.E(H) was suggested that the Government of India may be addressed to follow the following procedure:-

pp 1-3 of L.F. VI

Where the excess was due to adoption of tenders approved by competent authority, the work should be proceeded with even if such excesses may exceed the 10% limit. The particulars of revised sanctioned estimate would be furnished in the usual course as early as possible; but it should be taken that such excesses should be passed by the Government of India without objections as a matter of routine similiar to the procedure obtaining on State Government works. This matter was examined in consultation with Finance. A reference has been issued to the C.E(H) in which it has been suggested among other things that the most that the Government can ask the Government of India is that the delegation permitted in G.O.No. 2004 P.W. d/ 24-9-1943, should also be applicable to C.R.F. works. The C.E. has been asked to offer his remarks on this suggestion. His remarks are awaited.

Sub item 1 on para 5 on p 3 of L.F. VI

pp 6-8 of L.F. VI

p 11 of L.F. VI

para 2 on p 11 of L.F. VI

(E) in top file

6. Attention in this connection is also invited to pp.3-5 n.f. of L.F. III wherein the intention of D.S. appears to be that Government of India should be addressed if the excess is more than 10%.

7. In this particular case, the amounts approved

by the Government of India were for Rs.44,000/- Rs.65,000/- and Rs.48,000/- respectively for the construction of bridges at M.23/6, 24/3 and 27/3 of Bisley Ghat road. The amounts of tender for which approval is now sought are Rs. 48,770/- Rs.72,547/- and Rs.59,193/- respectively. As the excesses are over 10%, the excesses being 10.84%, 11.61% and 23.31%, the sanction of the Government of India is necessary with ref. to para. 17 of their Memo. explaining the C.R.F. rules and proceedure. In regard to the construction of the bridge across Koyyiurgedda at M.30/2 of K.D. Peta Koyyur road also, the excess for which approval of Government now sought is 35.7%. As regards the construction of a causeway across river Pennar at M.10/4 to 11/2 of Muddanur-Jammalamadugu road, the tender for which approval is now sought is 47.17% above E.R. // In the circumstances noted in para.4 above, it appears that the Government of India are to be appraised of the position. ~~In the circumstances noted however in paras. 2 and 5 above~~ For orders whether the C.E. may be asked to ~~approve or obtain the approval of the competent authority to the tenders~~ proceed with the work and submit the particulars of sanctioned estimates with full reasons for the increase in respect of each work for transmission to the Government of India for approval. If this view is accepted the tender papers in respect of the three items may be returned to the C.E. with suitable instructions. Draft Memo. submitted accordingly is for approval. Finance may see before issue.

p 1 of M
K on p 1 of
vide working sheet at K
p 20 of M
L.F II
p 1 of L.F II
L.F I
p 1 of L.F I.
Comptroller & C.E. In the Case of CI works the CE adopted such a procedure and the GI did not object. K
Keep file, L.F I and L.F II

MB/23.9.52
MP
24.9.52

Pending the receipt of CE's reply to the memo on p 11 of L.F IV, it seems desirable to inform GI at the earliest opportunity of any excess that may be anticipated over the sanctioned estimate - vide ff 22-23 of L.F IV., quoted para 17 on p 20 of M and p 11 of L.F III in which the GI were advised.

7

EC

in and the Case of the bridge across the Matlai Stream).
However, there seems to be no objection to ask the
CE to proceed with the work and expedite the
details of sanctioned Estimate for transmission to A.G.
In fact, he has done so in the Case of
C.C. Works and the A.G have accepted the Statement
submitted to them. Put it may be.

2/9/52

The Govt of India have no doubt to be informed at the earliest opportunity & their permission obtained for Expdre in excess of 10% above what they have sanctioned in each case. But this can be done in the form of the Statement referred to at A above.

25.9.52

PWD. No. 102266
Q/51-2
25.9.52

SENIOR ASSISTANT SECRETARY, FINANCE DEPARTMENT
25 SEP 1952
GOVERNMENT OF

FC
10629

Finance(Exp.C) Department.

This file deals with the question of obtaining the sanction of the Government of India in respect of Central Road Fund works where the revised estimate exceeds 10% over the original estimate sanctioned by the Government of India. The note of P.W. from ~~Secretary~~ P.4 above may be perused. The proposal of P.W. is to inform the Government of India at the earliest opportunity and to obtain their permission for expenditure in excess of 10% above what they have sanctioned in each case in the statement referred to at A ~~on p.7~~ above. (The form of the statement is on p.3 C F. of L.F.VI). They have also stated that there seems to be no objection to asking the

P.T.O

C.E. to proceed with the works and expedite the details of sanctioned estimates for transmission to Government of India. They have observed that the C.E. has done so in the case of cement concrete works. It is submitted that the case of cement concrete work dealt with in L.F.VI seems to be different from the cases referred to on p.6 above. The cement concreting works were approved by the Government of India under the Rs.120 lakhs scheme in 1951 and particulars of detailed sanctioned estimates for the works were sent to Government of India in the form on p.3 C.F. in L.F.VI. The original sanction for cement concreting works was based on approximate cost per mile, whereas the technicaly sanction now accorded is based on detailed estimates prepared for the work with the current schedule of rates which resulted in the excess of over 10%. According to para.17 of the Central Road Fund ~~Road~~ Rules and Procedure, the approval of the Government of India will have to be obtained to the revised estimate when the excess is more than 10% of the original estimate sanctioned by the Government of India. In connection with the work dealt with in L.F.IV. the Government of India stressed that in future the approval of the Government of India to excesses of more than ~~10%~~ 5% should not be anticipated. Attention is also invited in this connection to the letter on p.11 c.f. of L.F.III to the Government of India requesting them to sanction the revised estimate of Rs.73,663 based on contract value in lieu of the ~~sanctioned~~ estimated amount of Rs. ~~54,000/-~~ 48,861/- for the construction of R.C.T.Beam Slab Bridge acorss Vatlai Stream and their reply at pp.21-22 c.f. of L.F.III where the Government of India stated that the State Government should bear the expenditure over and above the sanctioned amount of Rs.54000/- for the work as there was no free balance in C.R.F. allocation and to the minutes of M.(Finance) on pp.15-16 N.F. of L.F.(III) It does not therefore seem safe to allow the C.E. to proceed with the works in anticipation of the approval of the Government of India for the revised estimates. In the

In the above circumstances it seems desirable to obtain the prior approval of the Government of India in the cases where the revised estimate exceeds 10% of the sanctioned estimate before the C.E. is asked to proceed with the works. Finance may advise accordingly.

4/10/52

In view of the remarks of the Govt. of India in paras. 2-6 of their letter dt 19-2-1952 on pgs. 22-23 c/f. in linked file IV & the position explained in the office note above, the Govt. of India will have to be informed immediately of the circumstances necessitating the increase of over 10 % over the sanctioned estimate, a revised estimate in proper form being also sent later. The work can ordinarily be proceeded with only after Govt. of India's approval is obtained. In very urgent cases the C.E. can be authorized to proceed with the work in anticipation of India's approval, the Govt. of India also being informed of the action taken.

4/10/52

Fin. U.O. 20629/EC/52-I
6.10.52.

ADDL. ASST. SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
7 OCT 1952
83240

7.10.52

P.T.O.

10

P.W.D.(R-1.)

Please see the notes of Fin. at pp.7 to 9 above. In view of Fin. remarks at A above, on page the Govt. of India may be addressed for their approval. A draft letter is submitted. As suggested by Fin., the C.E.(H) may be authorised to proceed with "very urgent" cases of works in anticipation of approval by the Govt. of India. Draft Endt. is also submitted for approval. With reference to X above it does not appear that a revised estimate need be sent - vide cl.16 of the Memo. regarding C.R.F. This course of action may also be intimated to the Govt. of India as draft letter provides for this.

16/10/52

21.10.52

[Issued as Letter No. 102266-R/57-3 dt 21-10-52 from the Govt of India Ministry of Transport No. W11-28(6)52 dated 12-11-52] P/57-?? P 21 C

Please see the orders of the Govt of India at P 21 C. This may be communicated to the C.E.(H) for necessary action. Draft Endt submitted for approval for may see after issue

14/11/52

14.11.52

P.W.D.
No 102266-R/57-6

ADDITIONAL DEPUTY SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
EC
15 NOV 1952
85053
FINANCE DEPARTMENT

Fin(Exp.C)

(Previous fin note on pp 7-9 above)

The further note of P.W. on p 10 above, and the correspondence on pp 19-21 CF may be perused.

Chief 29/11/52

26/11/52 P.W.

Fin no NO.
85053 Exp.C/52-1
26-11-52
101428

From the C.E.C(H) Lr No 57058-D2/51-6 dated 13-11-52

The note of the Fin Deptt above may be perused. The C.E.C(H) has reported that the three works referred to in Govt Endt No 102266Q/51-4 P.W.D 21-10-52 are being entrusted to M/s P. Ramaswamy & Co, Coimbatore for execution as they are urgent and as this is the working season. He has requested that the approval to the lowest tender of M/s P. Ramaswamy & Co may be sent early.

2. It may be mentioned that in Govt Memo No 102266Q/51-1 P.W.D 3.6.52 the C.E.C(H) was asked to report why these works should not be executed departmentally. In his letter dated 8.8.1952 the C.E.C(H) enumerated the difficulties of departmental execution. Subsequently the Govt of India were addressed to accord revised approval to the works at the costs of the Contract value quoted by the lowest tenderers M/s P. Ramaswamy and Co. The C.E.C(H) was authorised to proceed with the works if they were urgent. The Govt of India have approved the revised costs of the works and the orders have already been communicated to the C. (communicating the orders) Endt dated 14-11-52 may therefore be deemed approval of the lowest negotiated offers of M/s P. Ramas & Co. However, with reference to the letter at p 21 the position may be clarified to the C.E.C(H). The draft memo submitted below is for approval.

ADDITIONAL DEPUTY SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
15 DEC 1952
094258
FINANCE DEPARTMENT

P. for Dy Secy
No 102266Q/51-7
15.12.52

13/12

13.12.52

13/12/52

15.12.52

12

Fin (Exp C)

(Last seen in Fin. on p. 11 above)

The further note of P.W. on p. 11 above and the draft memo below may be perused.

KW 22.12.52 Asst 22.12.52

23/12/52 P.W.

P.W.

Jonathan

23/12/52

Box

Fin. Br. O.
94358/EC/52
23.12.52

1099 23

24 DEC 1952

Joined as Memo No 10(2)2662/51-8 d/24.12.52